UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/796,051	03/10/2004	Chang Lim	3282-C-2-Z	4734

7590 10/03/2005	**EXAMINER**
George M. MacGregor	BAROT, BHARAT
Marks & Clerk	

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2155	

George M. MacGregor
Marks & Clerk
P.O. Box 957, Station B
55 Metcalfe St. , Suite 1380
Ottawa, ON K1P 587
CANADA

DATE MAILED: 10/03/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

-- *The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address* --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE <u>3</u> MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.
- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
  Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>08 July 2005</u>.

2a)☒ This action is **FINAL**.   2b)☐ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *7-14,27-33,39 and 40* is/are pending in the application.

   4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *7-14,27-33,39 and 40* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

   Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

   Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

   a)☐ All   b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

   1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

   2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

   3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

   * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>07/08/2005</u>.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6) ☐ Other: _____.

RESPONSE TO AMENDMENT

1.   Claims 7-14, 27-33, and 39-40 remain for further examination.

The old rejection maintained

2.   Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 7-14, 27-33, and 39-40 filed on July 08, 2005 have been fully considered but they are not deemed to be persuasive for the claims 7-14, 27-33, and 39-40. The rejection is respectfully maintained as set forth in the last Office Action mailed on April 08, 2005.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103(a)

3.   The text of those sections of Title 35, U.S. Code not included in this action can be found in a prior Office action.

4.   Claims 7-12 and 39-40 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Baker et al (U.S. Patent No. 5,678,041) in view of Hu (U.S. Patent No. 5,586,260).

5.   As to claim 7, Baker discloses a system for authorizing a user of a client to have access to a server via network (see abstract; and figures 1-3) comprising: means in the client for inputting a user ID, user password, and a unique client address (URL); communication means at the client for passing the ID, password, and address to the server via the network in response to a request (figures 1 and 3; column 4 lines 1-43;

and column 7 lines 3-16); means at the server to store information respecting the client and to compare the stored information with the user ID and user password; means at the server to store dynamic status information (resource rating and user clearance) respecting the user, the status information being one of enabled, disabled or active; and means to authorize log in of the user if the ID and password agree with the stored information and if the user status is enabled (figures 1 and 3; column 4 line 44 to column 5 line 44; and column 6 line 49 to column 7 line 16).

However, Baker does not explicitly disclose a system for authorizing a user of a client to have access to a server via network comprising: means in the client for storing a unique client address; and means at the client to store dynamic status information respecting the user, the status information being one of enabled, disabled or active.

Hu discloses a system for authorizing a user of a client to have access to a server via network comprising: means in the client for storing a unique client address; and means at the client to store dynamic status information respecting the user, the status information being one of enabled, disabled or active (figure 4; column 1 line 59 to column 2 line 25; and column 5 line 59 to column 6 line 11).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the means in the client of Hu with the system for authorizing a user of a client to have access to a server via network of Baker for storing a unique client address and dynamic status information respecting the user because doing so would provide flexible approach to improve the authentication between client and server.

6.   As to claims 8-10, Baker discloses that the status information is changed to

active when the user is granted access to the server; the user is denied access to the

server if the status information is disabled; and if the statues information is active the

server compares the client address with the stored information and if the address agree

with the stored information the user is logged onto the server otherwise the user is

denied access (figures 1 and 3; column 4 line 44 to column 5 line 44; and column 6 line

49 to column 7 line 16).

7.   As to claim 11, Baker discloses that the client is an end user of an customer

service management system and the server is a service director (proxy server) having

means (processor) to manipulate a user=s private network (LAN) (figure 1; and column

3 lines 55-67).

8.   As to claims 39-40, Baker discloses that the means to authorize log in includes

means to prevent log in if the user is already logged in; and the status information

relates to whether the user is enabled, disabled or active (figures 1 and 3; column 4 line

44 to column 5 line 44; and column 6 line 49 to column 7 line 51).

9.   As to claim 12, it is rejected for the same reasons set forth to rejecting claim 7

above, since claim 12 is merely a method of operation for the apparatus defined in the

apparatus claim 7.

10.   Claims 13-14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over

LaStrange et al (U.S. Patent No. 5,784,058).

11.   As to claim 13, LaStrange discloses a system providing information on a client's

browser screen in response to a request from a user comprising: a two frame window

on the browser screen; an icon or symbol button associated with a first frame window;

and link means between the client and a server whereby activation of the icon or symbol

button retrieves information relating to subject matter displayed on a second frame

window from the server (see abstract; figures 5-6s; column 4 lines 3-47; column 4 line

53 to column 5 line 51).

       However, LaStrange does not explicitly disclose that the information is the help

information, the icon or symbol button is a help button, the first frame window is a

dashboard frame window, and the second frame window is a context frame window.

       It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the

invention was made to incorporate the information as a help information, the icon or

symbol button as a help button, the first frame window as a dashboard frame window,

and the second frame window as a context frame window with the system of LaStrange

for providing information on a client's browser screen in response to a request from a

user because doing so would provide help information from the server without over

writing on the original information.

12.   As to claim 14, LaStrange discloses the server is a customer service

management services director on a multi technology network (figure 1; and column 3

line 24-35).

13.   Claims 27-33 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over

Davis et al (U.S. Patent No. 5,796,952).

14.   As to claims 27 and 31, Davis discloses a system for storing information

respecting a plurality of applications to a shared memory comprising: a volatile memory

for storing the information; means to allocate space in the volatile memory to selected

ones of the plurality of applications; identification means for identifying the space

allocated to each of the selected applications; and backup means to periodically transfer

stored information from the volatile memory to non-volatile memory (figure 2; and

column 7 line 30 to column 9 line 15).

        However, Davis does not explicitly disclose that retrieves the information from the

non-volatile memory at system startup and stores the information to the non-volatile

memory at system shut down. But it would have been obvious and known in the art at

the time the invention was made to retrieve the information from the non-volatile

memory at system startup and store the information to the non-volatile memory at

system shut down because doing so would reduce data or information loss problem.

15.   As to claims 28-29, Davis discloses that the volatile memory is a random access

memory (RAM) and non-volatile memory is a hard disk storing device (figure 2; and

column 7 lines 30-49).

16.   As to claim 30, Davis discloses that the means to allocate space is a daemon

process (figure 2; and column 7 line 66 to column 8 line 5).

17.   As to claims 32-33, Davis discloses that the shared memory is in a server in a

communication system; and the communication system is a customer service

management system and the server is a service director (figures 3-7; column 9 lines 16-

45; and column 11 line 34 to column 12 line 50).

Response to Arguments

18.   Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 7-14, 27-33, and 39-40 filed on July

08, 2005 have been fully considered but they are not deemed to be persuasive for the

claims 7-14, 27-33, and 39-40.

19.   In the remarks, the applicant argues that:

(A)   Argument: Neither Baker nor Hu teach or suggest storing dynamic status information respecting the user (enabled, disabled, and active) and a prima facie case of obviousness has not been established with respect to claims 7-12 and 39-40.

Response: Baker discloses that means at the server to store dynamic status information (resource rating and user clearance) respecting the user, the status information being one of enabled, disabled or active (figures 1 and 3; column 4 line 44 to column 5 line 44; and column 6 line 49 to column 7 line 16).

Hu discloses that means at the client to store dynamic status information respecting the user, the status information being one of enabled, disabled or active (figure 4; column 1 line 59 to column 2 line 25; and column 5 line 59 to column 6 line 11).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the means in the client of Hu with the system for authorizing a user of a client to have access to a server via network of Baker for storing a unique client address and dynamic status information respecting the user because doing so would provide flexible approach to improve the authentication between client and server.

In response to applicant's arguments against the references individually, one cannot show nonobviousness by attacking references individually where the rejections are based on combinations of references. See *In re Keller*, 642 F.2d 413, 208 USPQ 871 (CCPA 1981); *In re Merck & Co.*, 800 F.2d 1091, 231 USPQ 375 (Fed. Cir. 1986).

(B)   Argument: LaStrange fails to teach or suggest any help information or any way to drive such help information from the dual screen concept, as taught by the present application and as recited in the claims 13-14.

Response: LaStrange discloses a system providing information on a client's browser screen in response to a request from a user comprising: a two frame window on the browser screen; an icon or symbol button associated with a first frame window; and link means between the client and a server whereby activation of the icon or symbol button retrieves information relating to subject matter displayed on a second frame window from the server (see abstract; figures 5-6s; column 4 lines 3-47; column 4 line 53 to column 5 line 51).

However, LaStrange does not explicitly disclose that the information is the help information, the icon or symbol button is a help button, the first frame window is a dashboard frame window, and the second frame window is a context frame window.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the information as a help information, the icon or symbol button as a help button, the first frame window as a dashboard frame window, and the second frame window as a context frame window with the system of LaStrange for providing information on a client's browser screen in response to a request from a user because doing so would provide help information from the server without over writing on the original information.

(C)   Argument: Davice fails to teach or suggest means to retrieve information from non-volatile memory at system start up, as taught by the present application and as recited in the claims 27-33.

Response: Davis discloses a system for storing information respecting a plurality of applications to a shared memory comprising: a volatile memory for storing the information; means to allocate space in the volatile memory to selected ones of the plurality of applications; identification means for identifying the space allocated to each of the selected applications; and backup means to periodically transfer stored information from the volatile memory to non-volatile memory (figure 2; and column 7 line 30 to column 9 line 15).

However, Davis does not explicitly disclose that retrieves the information from the non-volatile memory at system startup and stores the information to the non-volatile memory at system shut down. But it would have been obvious and known in the art at the time the invention was made to retrieve the information from the non-volatile memory at system startup and store the information to the non-volatile memory at system shut down because doing so would reduce data or information loss problem.

**(D)   Applicant's arguments do not comply with 37 CFR 1.111(c) because they do not clearly point out the patentable novelty which he or she thinks the claims present in view of the state of the art disclosed by the references cited or the objections made. Further, they do not show how the amendments avoid such references or objections.

20.   **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a). A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Contact Information

21.   Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to **Bharat Barot** whose Telephone Number is **(571) 272-3979**. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday from 9:30 AM to 6:00 PM. Most facsimile-transmitted patent application related correspondence is required to be sent to the Central FAX Number **(571) 273-8300**.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, **Saleh Najjar**, can be reached at **(571) 272-4006**.

BHARAT BAROT
PRIMARY EXAMINER

Patent Examiner Bharat Barot

Art Unit 2155

September 22, 2005